RRR
ROTHBARD-ROCKWELL REPORT
JULY 1991 VOLUME II, NUMBER 7

The Right To Kill, With Dignity?

by Murray N. Rothbard

For a long time now we have been subjected to a barrage of pro-death propaganda by Left-Liberals, and by their cheering squad, Left, or Modal, Libertarians. The "right to die," the "right to die with dignity" (whatever that means), the right to get someone to assist you in suicide, the "right to euthanasia," etc. Up till now, Left-Liberals have at least appeared to be scrupulous in stressing the crucial importance of consent by the killed victim, because *otherwise* the right to die with dignity looks very much like the right to commit murder. For what is compulsory euthanasia but murder, pure and simple?

But now the mask has begun to slip. One of the great enthusiasms of the right-to-die forces has long been the Living Will, in which the prospective candidate for euthanasia signs a form requesting his family, medical authorities, etc., to pull the plug under specified conditions. I have long been queasy about the consensual bona fides of the right-to-diers and have wondered what would happen if somebody wrote a Living Will that was spunky instead of spineless, that insistently favored his own life as against his death.

Now we know, and the answer, to say the least, is not good. Helga Wanglie, an elderly lady in Minneapolis, wrote a Living Will, but she opted for being kept alive if she lapsed into a vegetative state. Now 87, she is indeed in such a state, and her husband, respecting Helga's wishes in realizing that only while there is life can there be hope, is anxious to respect Helga's wishes and keep her alive. Note, too, that Helga's medical cost is being covered privately, by private health insurance; Helga is no burden on the taxpayer.

So what's the problem? The problem is that the medical authorities, in their wisdom, have decided that since Helga's case is hopeless, *they* should have the right to pull the plug, overriding the wishes of Helga on this issue. But what are the medical authorities, whose very profession pledges them to keep patients alive to the best of their ability, advocating here if it is not mere murder? The Minnesota doctors, having decided that Helga Wanglie is not fit to live, propose to murder her, and they, and other liberals, are sneering at the Wanglies for being backward Neanderthals in trying to affirm her life. Will somebody explain to me

(Cont. page 3, col. 1)

The left-wing pro-death coalition?

THE EAR

By Sarah Barton

A prominent libertarian coin dealer [LCD] — no, not Burt, silly — recently called up a distinguished libertarian coin dealer rater [CDR] and asked him why the CDR was not plugging his coin company. The CDR, not a man to mince words, told the LCD: "Because you're a goddam crook, and your customers always get fleeced."

* * * * * *

Big news on the Koch-topus front. John Blundell, the Brit who displaced Leonard Liggio as president of the Institute for Humane Studies (IHS), has just been promoted to the plum job of head of all Kochian philanthropy. This job, held for many years by George Pearson, was then given to Richie Fink as reward for his lobbying efforts. But Fink has now moved up a notch to overall head of the entire expanding Kochian hierarchy, with Blundell underneath him as top philanthropoid. And Wayne Gable, a Finkian who succeeded

(Cont. next page,col. 1)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(THE EAR cont. from P.1)

Richie as head of Citizens for a Sound Economy (CSE), has been advanced to the post of Washington lobbyist for Koch Industries.

John Blundell keeps with him the prize headship of the Atlas Foundation, which he acquired after the death of Atlas founder Antony Fisher; it was the fact that Blundell was able to incorporate Atlas into the Kochtopus that made him a permanent star in the eyes of Charles Koch.

But this leaves the headship of IHS open for grabs. Who will get it, a Finkian, a Craniac, or an independent? No one knows for sure, but the smart money is betting on Richie. And if Blundell's star is rising, what happens to Ed "Sexual Diversity" Crane, who took the bold move of hiring Sheldon Richman after Sheldon was suddenly and brutally fired by Blundell? Stay tuned.

* * * * * *

It figures. As libertarians become more and more socially and culturally Leftist, some Leftists have become Libertarians. Why not? One is Professor Paul Kurtz, long-time professional atheist, who edits *The Humanist* magazine and heads Prometheus Books. So far, the only apparent fruits of this conversion have been two Prometheus books by libertarian theoretician and Cato lecturer George Smith: a reprint of his *The Case for Atheism*, and a recent collection of Smith's essays.

However, another fruit of Kurtz's new-found libertarianism is a "Sexual Autobiography" (read pornography) series. The latest celebration of the polymorphously perverse is *Whips and Kisses — Parting the Leather Curtain* by "Mistress Jacqueline," "as told to" Catherine Tavel and Robert H. Rimmer. We are relieved to see that Mistress Jacqueline is the most successful dominatrix on the West Coast; after all, we wouldn't want any fraud to be perpetrated on the eager book-buying public. Also, it turns out that Mistress Jacqueline is really Alice, a "middle-class girl from the Bronx" and "classic overachiever" [Good Lord! What's an *under*achiever in this area?], and refers to herself as a "fantasy engineer." Like everyone else, Mistress Jacqueline is "working toward a doctorate degree in counseling." Hey — is the world becoming a self-parody, or what? We are, in particular, assured that all of the "unspeakable acts" committed by Mistress Jacqueline and her customers? clients? patients? are not wrong or perverse at all, since they are all "founded on consensuality and mutual agreement." So much for her, and her publishers' libertarian bona fides.

It figures. Some Leftists have become Libertarians.

There is an amusing connection here with Prometheus' other author, George Smith. In his own Good Samaritan version of libertarian theory, George argues that if a third party happens to come across A using force on B, he should have the legal right to intervene against A without liability, even if it turns out that A's force was perfectly legitimate — say, in trying to defend himself against B's previous assault, or in trying to get B to disgorge stolen property. In other words, busybodies have the right to intervene in a violent dispute, immune from liability for error.

The delicious image arises: what if George Smith, heroic libertarian Samaritan, should happen to stumble upon his fellow-Prometheus author Mistress Jacqueline, administering consensual therapy to a client by way of whips, padlocks, torture, etc.? Surely, Smith would be obliged to use violence upon the Mistress to liberate her hapless seeming victim and slave! And what then? And who arbitrates, who apologizes to whom, and—more to the point when dealing with libertarians—who *pays* whom? And who would want to be the "libertarian judge" trying to figure the whole thing out?

* * * * * *

When John Blundell was offered the vice presidency of IHS a few years ago, the head of another thinktank also tried to recruit him. He couldn't offer any more money, said this man, but he could promise "unlimited sex with the staff." John was not enticed.

* * * * *

The same guy who offered promiscuity as a fringe benefit

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tried to take it home recently, installing a beautiful Russian girl as a "guest" in his house. The missus, however, tossed the young woman out.

* * * * *

The LP national convention in Chicago is shaping up as even more of a lulu than I had thought.

Item: Sue Walton, head of LEI, Ltd., the outfit running the convention, admits in a memo to LP NatCom that the speakers, traditionally big names, will largely be people no one, including LPers, has ever heard of. As she says, "there will be few familiar faces among our main stream events." Great start! But we are assured that the workshops will be filled with illustrious types like Steve Dasbach, Nick Youngers, Tonie Nathan, et al. I can hardly wait. In fact, the *only* speakers lined up by the end of April were Ron Paul, Joe Sobran, and Jack Herer (who dat?). That means that the only two recognizable speakers are paleos. Memo to Ron and Joe: Atlas, why don't you shrug, and stop giving credibility to these bozos? But if you must go, take a tip: get the check in advance, and make sure it clears, before you leave the Windy City.

Why does *anyone* take this crazy party seriously?

Item: LEI's much heralded credit card acceptance had, by late April, "unfortunately been delayed," but Sue was hoping for it soon.

Item: A stage and lighting guy from New York, Clay S. Conrad, obviously a savvy professional, kept urging Sue Walton and the LP to get professional lighting and design so that the LP would not look like the boobish amateurs they really are on C-Span, as they did at the 1989 convention. Conrad offered to do the whole thing at special cheap rates. But he couldn't get the time of day from Sue Walton, who, after a long runaround, finally turned him down flat. Welcome to the world of the LP, Clay Conrad, and...goodbye!

Item: But for Sue Walton, all this is OK because she has the box lunch question down pat! I kid you not, but Sue sent no less than two memos to all NatCom officers announcing with great enthusiasm that LEI is providing Marriott box lunches to all NatCom committees at cost, that is, $8.25 per person. She lovingly details in her memo what the box lunch will be: Tuesday, croissant sandwich, fruit, brownie, etc. Is this woman for real? Is the LP for real? Think about this: can anyone imagine a real political convention director detailing the box lunch contents to national committee biggies? Readers, donors, libertarians: why does *anyone* take this crazy party seriously? ●

(RIGHTS...cont. from P.1)

how this attitude differs from that of Nazi doctors, with their zeal to exterminate people whose lives they considered unfit?

The right to kill seems to be the established medical position. Thus, Minnesota "medical ethicist" Dr. Steven Miles: "We are certain this person cannot change from her present condition. Shouldn't we be making sure that we're responsible in allocating the resources...to keep costs down for everybody?" Notice the paramount consideration given to the collective "we," with individuals not allowed to decide their own costs, and with the Doctor, long professionally accustomed to playing God, now playing Satan.

Maryland University professor Oliver Childs declaims; "Despite the feelings of the family...the final decision should be made by the medical authorities. Prolonging life creates a burden on family and friends....It can also be very expensive." Expenses which the burdened family is not to be allowed to shoulder.

No social-medical problem is complete without a pronouncement from neo-conservative medical economist Harry Schwartz, for three decades an editorial writer for the *New York Times*. Schwartz sneers at the "values of individual autonomy and the sanctity of human life" which have to give way to more important values, such as that health resources are limited, and that health care must be allocated rationally. Schwartz is nothing if not hard-nosed: "the harsh truth is that most of these people will never wake up. So, the basic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

problem is why we let so many vegetables receive useless care for so long." The problem, opines Schwartz, is that our health insurance systems, private as well as public, are "too mindlessly generous." Schwartz concludes: "The time to end this idiocy is now." (*USA Today*, May 30).

Our final specimen is Derek Humphry, head of the Hemlock Society, the most venerable of the right to suicide groups, and careful up to now to stress consent. Where does *he* stand on the case of Helga Wanglie? Humphry begins by saying that patients "should always have the right of choice to live or die," and if they are in a persistent vegetative state, their families should decide. OK, so what about Helga Wanglie? Here is Humphry's new and contradictory position: "If overwhelming medical opinion says treatment is pointless, courts should arbitrate disputes between doctors and families." Now just a minute: where do *courts* get the right to decide life or death? Does government have more of a right to commit murder than doctors, or what? And on what principles are the courts supposed to decide that "arbitration"?

No, the mask is off, and Doctor Assisted Death and Mr. Liberal Death With Dignity, and all the rest of the crew turn out to be simply Doctor and Mister Murder. Watch out Mr. and Ms. America: liberal humanists, lay and medical, are not only out to regulate your lives, and to fleece your wallets and pocketbooks. They're out to kill you! Libertarians, as embodied in the sainted "Nolan Chart," have always assumed that conservatives are in favor of economic liberty, whereas liberals are in favor of civil, or personal liberty. *This is* "personal liberty"?

The excuses of these killers is that far more important than prolonging life is the "quality of life." But what if a key part of preserving and enhancing that quality is getting rid of this crew of murdering liberals, people whom Isabel Paterson, with wonderful perception and prophetic insight, termed "the humanitarian with the guillotine"? What then? So where do we sign up to assist *their* death? ●

Rockwell vs. Rodney and the Libertarian World

by M.N.R.

Anyone who knows Lew Rockwell knows that he can take care of himself, that he doesn't need me or anyone else to leap to his defense. In fact, Lew enjoys it when libertarians go bananas about him, because it confirms his already low opinion of the Modal Libertarian. But I'm getting sick of it. I'm getting sick of cretins and half-illiterates, of bozos who can hardly parse a sentence, who have achieved nothing at all in their miserable lives, displaying the unmitigated gall, the flagrant chutzpah, to presume to sit down and read Lew out of libertarianism. A typical letter received: "Dear Mr. Rockwell: I didn't read your article, but I read Bill Bradford in *Liberty*, and I agree that you're a fascist, you're not a libertarian at all, and you should be read out of the human race." Bradford is a business man who decided to buy himself a libertarian magazine. Well fine, but so what? What's he ever done apart from that? The fact that he *calls himself* a scholar and philosopher should cut no ice with anyone.

There are real problems in the world that cry out for libertarian analysis and action. One key problem was the late Gulf War, that made virtually every American "feel good about himself" and about the American State, and apparently accomplished nothing else — except the slaughter of about 200,000 Iraqis. One would think that libertarians would be passionately interested in this issue. Were they? Hell no. Most libertarians couldn't care less about the whole issue. Half of the LP members supported the war. And Bradford? As usual, he hemmed and hawed on both sides of the issue, getting indignant only at a few readers who *thought* he had opposed the Gulf War.

In a laid-back movement of this sort, one that cares little about such vital problems as war and mass murder, you would think it would take some truly cataclysmic issue to elicit widespread anathemas and excommunication. But you would be wrong. When Lew Rockwell came to the defense of the LAPD's beating of *one*, read one, criminal, Rodney King, one would have thought that the earth had opened and Armageddon had been launched at last. Such agony, such hatred, such *geschrei*, had not been seen in the libertarian movement since Ayn Rand kicked Nathaniel Branden out of Paradise in 1968.

From the hysteria and disproportionality, it is obvious that much more is going on here than is apparent on the surface, that as in many other cases, the Modals are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not engaging in sober reasoning on the issue, but are carrying out some hidden agenda that is not part of official libertarian programs and protocols.

Before getting to the hidden agenda, let us consider the alleged provocation: the Rodney King case. We have here a problem of Rush to Judgment by Videotape, part of the trivialization and sentimentalization of public opinion, which more and more resets on where video cameras happen to be pointing. Throughout the entire 20th century, the American public had never heard of a Kurd, and cared nothing about their dreams or aspirations, about their oppression or their betrayal by Henry Kissinger years ago. Then, because the videocameras of the world happened to be pointing in the direction of thousands of fleeing and poverty-stricken Kurds, George Bush was forced to reverse his original decision not to intervene, and to send troops and supplies in for God knows how long to preserve an independent Kurdish entity. If the TV cameras had been pointed to Ethiopia, or toward the Shiites in southern Iraq, who knows what crazy intervention Bush would have felt forced to undertake?

Yes, Rodney King was vigorously beaten by L.A. cops with batons. In all the hysteria, no one seems to have asked *why* they kept beating on King. That's because videocameras are dumb, and people who follow them blindly are even dumber. Videocameras know nothing of context. What was the context of the King beating?

1. Rodney King was a convicted criminal, armed robber, on parole. *Not* a libertarian, or a model citizen, or even a decent one.

2. Rodney King was speeding maniacally on the highways and on the city streets. When flagged down by the cops, he speeded up, refusing to stop and be questioned. Anyone who knows anything about traffic or any other cops knows that they like their orders for quiet, standing still, etc. to be obeyed, and they get nervous when these orders are disobeyed. And, in the context of our criminal urban population, *there is nothing wrong with that.* Having been led on a wild and merry chase, the cops were already edgy. But then King refused to get out of the car, had to be pulled from it, and then refused all orders to stand still, insisting on dancing around, advancing on the cops in a menacing manner, and making obscene threats to a lady cop. What were the cops supposed to do in this situation?

The anti-Rockwell Modals are carrying out a hidden agenda.

3. In the good old days, before left-liberalism did its evil work, the cops knew what to do in this potentially menacing situation. (Remember: they had no way of knowing if King was armed.) They would have administered a choke hold on Rodney King, which would have subdued him immediately. But the noxious forces of left-liberalism (supported, no doubt, by the equally noxious and far more hypocritical forces of Modal Libertarianism), had gotten choke holds outlawed as being unfair to the poor criminals.

4. So what was left? The cops shot Rodney King with a tazer gun, which inflicts no lasting harm, but which knocks out the recipient's muscles and forces him to lie down and be subdued. Tazers always work — except that Rodney King, though shot *twice* with a tazer, unprecedentedly showed no ill effects whatever. Like Rasputin, who seemed superhuman and invincible, Rodney King kept dancing around maniacally and advancing on the cops in a threatening fashion.

So now what, wiseguys? If *you* were in the cops' spot at that point, what would *you* have done? Try to *reason* with Rodney King, like Bob LeFevre? Try to give him a short course in Randian theory? Given the failure of the tazer, given the outlawing of the choke hold, there was only one thing the cops could do: and that was to beat Rodney King into submission with batons. Except a couple of baton blows couldn't do it. *Why* did the cops keep beating King again and again with their batons? The Rasputin factor; he simply wouldn't go down.

Sorry, there was one more thing the cops could have done: they could have taken their guns out and shot the S.O.B.. Would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you have been happy with *that*, Mr. and Ms. Modal?

5. There is life after the King beating. A couple of weeks after the incident, King allegedly assaulted a police officer with a deadly weapon. Soon after *that*, Rodney King, actually and not simply allegedly picked up a transvestite prostitute in his truck; as they were about to perform a lewd act, the cops advanced upon them, whereupon King tried to run down a police officer with his car.

Let us again ponder the Rasputin Factor: Rodney King received a beating which would have put most of us in the hospital for many months. Yet only a couple of weeks later, the guy is cheerfully picking up a transvestite prostitute.

The L.A. cops and Lew Rockwell have been implicitly or explicitly accused of "racism" in this affair because King is black. But I venture to assert that the shoe is on the other foot: that if King had been *white*, there would have been no national fuss at all, there would have been no hysterical calls, by the ACLU and others, for Chief Gates' immediate ouster or for criminal prosecution of the officers. And there would have been no nation-wide hysteria by the myriad of other libertarian jackasses. In short, what we are seeing, among Modal Libertarians as well as their left-liberal cousins, is racism-in-reverse.

Of the host of libertarian criticisms of Rockwell's article, *only one* was sober, rational, coherent, and non-hysterical, that of Justin Raimondo in the *Libertarian Republican*. Justin did not agree with Rockwell's position, but it was a pleasure to read, because it was a model of what libertarian discussion should be all about, and used to be before the libertarians decided to stop thinking for themselves and fall into a Politically Correct goosestep.

Essentially, Justin holds that while private guards might have been justified in beating Rodney King, that police, being government officers, must be held to a far more rigorous standard. This is a cogent position, with which I have a great deal of sympathy, but I have come to the conclusion that it is not satisfactory. I would like to see all government functions, including police, privatized, but *pending* that consummation devoutly to be wished, I now believe that those government functions which are actually valuable services (e.g. roads, mail carrying, or police, but *not* regulating industry or levying taxes) should be carried out *as far as possible* like a private business. Thus, government is a lousy mail carrier and should get out of the mail carrying business — or at the very least allow private competition—but failing that and keeping the mail monopoly, it should try to carry out its job as efficiently and as like a private firm as possible. Some libertarians (*not* Justin Raimondo) hold that all government functions should be carried out as *inefficiently* as possible (e.g. mail carriers should be throwing mail into the dumpster) so as to discredit the State and bring about privatization rapidly. But I think this is a repellent strategy and inflicts needless pain and extra oppression on a citizenry already sufficiently oppressed by the State.

So *why* did such a host of libertarians rouse themselves from their usual stupor to hurl curses and anathema at a long-time leading libertarian for one disagreement on a scarcely earth-shaking issue? The answer is a hidden agenda, and that agenda is the entire social and cultural mind-set of Left-Liberalism. For our beloved Modals *are* indeed social and cultural Leftists, more so even than we had originally suspected; they have bought into the entire panoply of feminism, egalitarianism, victimology, "civil rights," the sanctity of the compulsory integrationist, socialist, and fake "Doctor" Martin Luther King, and all the rest of the odious baggage. In short, these Left-Libertarians have bought into the whole Politically Correct package, and as in the case of all P.C.'s, everyone who disagrees with them on any of these issues is automatically stigmatized with the litany of "racist, sexist, and homophobic."

Note that while Left-Liberals are scarcely advocates of the free market, they don't really *care* about that any more; no student, for example, ever gets hauled up on charges for being too enthusiastic about the free market, or about cuts in the capital gains tax, or for being excessively critical of socialism or the planned economy. That is not the cutting edge of *today's* political issues, and so the Liberal Establishment is willing to tolerate Left Libertarians who are Correct on the issues that matter, and to keep them around as occasional pets. Not so, however, with paleos, whether paleocons or paleolibertarians, who, being on the cutting edge of today's issues, enjoy no such indulgence from the Establishment. But pretty soon, the Modals will Get Theirs. What Tom Fleming said in his wonderful

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

article on "The New Fusionism" in the May *Chronicles* of the way the Establishment will eventually dispose of its current conservative allies, applies in spades to how they will get rid of whichever Left-Libertarians have managed to Make It in the current political climate.

Fleming writes: "they [the "official conservatives"] have established a cozy relationship with the leftist establishment media who recognize them for what they are: safe and well-groomed lapdogs who bark but never bite. When the day comes that they are no longer needed, the conservatives will be treated like a lower-class sweetheart picked up for a summer affair. I only hope they're given carfare for the long ride home back to their side of town." Considering their social status and their cultural values, I'm sure that the Left-Libertarians will neither expect nor receive carfare. They'll be happy with the right to hitch-hike.

The Road To Rome?

by M.N.R.

The hottest new rumor among Left-Libertarians is that I have taken "The Vows," that is, that I have joined the Catholic Church. The hottest new rumor among neo-cons is that Paul Gottfried has just done likewise. Paul and I have put our heads together and agreed that that is the best single reason yet for signing up.

What's with these dingbats? It says a great deal about the mentality of these people — both Left-Libertarian and the neo-con wing of The Enemy, who are in so many ways brothers and sisters under the skin. First, it shows that, for them, joining the Catholic Church is just about the worst thing you can say about your enemy. Why is that? Why, for them, should becoming a Catholic be the ultimate in disgrace? What deep-structure motivation accounts for this curious phenomenon? As for me, I for one do not consider becoming a Catholic on a par with becoming a child molester; on the contrary, I consider it an honorable course. Presumably, one reason for this rumor is that in recent years I have been championing the role of Christianity in human affairs, and in particular that of the original and continuing Christian Church — known inaccurately to most people as "Roman Catholic." Apparently, these Modals, Randians and post-Randians to the man, are incapable of understanding how anyone could be appreciative of the Christian Church without actually having been converted — or, in their eyes, snatched up, something like the invasion of the body snatchers. How could I, a non-believer, become an ardent fan of Christianity? Because, unlike the Modals, whose world-view has evidently been frozen in aspic for decades in the middle of *Atlas Shrugged*, I've learned something over the years.

I am the last person to decry gossip, but it's amazing how much time and energy Modals spend on inventing, contemplating, or spreading rumors. But why not? After all, they've got nothing else to do.

Well, I might as well let you Modals in on it; the Pope has decided to make me a Cardinal *in pectore*. When the time is right, he will disclose this appointment to the world. Remember: you heard it first here. •

Contra Don Feder

by M.N.R.

The latest neo-con tactic on the neo-paleo split is to deny that such a split within conservatism exists. *Everyone* is supposedly on the side of the neo-cons, except of course Pat Buchanan, who has apparently created the split within his own fevered imagination. What about the rest of us? As Rand used to say: Blankout.

Conservative columnist Don Feder is the latest to weigh in with this tactic (*Boston Herald*, May 9). Like so many others, Don was horrified at Pat's column quoting Paul Gottfried's now famous article in *RRR*, "Scrambling for Funds." So what about *us*? Feder dismisses us as just simply, terribly *obscure*. Poor Paul Gottfried is so obscure, he doesn't have to be named; Feder only mentions that Paul teaches in an "obscure" college. Feder also sneers at *RRR*s circulation. Not very long ago, conservatives, in a small minority among opinion molders, did not consider small circulation a badge of shame; almost the contrary. But now that the neo-con-run conservative movement is all over the media, Numbers become the criterion for being taken seriously.

And yet Feder, a former Randian and therefore a long-time enemy of libertarians, can't resist the occasion to fulminate against obscure me at some length, despite our "*Tropical Fish Quarterly*-sized circulation." His major indictment is that, horrors! I favor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legalizing prostitution and hard drugs. Feder, his world these days gravitating somewhere between Norman Podhoretz and Bill Bennett, does not seem to realize that not only does virtually every free-market economist advocate drug (and presumably prostitution) legalization, but that so do almost all economists of *any* persuasion. I am the last person in the world to cite the word of economists as a final authority, but at least Feder should realize that these views are not bizarre or outlandish except in the small corner of the world that he inhabits.

Feder, dredging up the Soviet threat once more, accuses me of being opposed to national defense and advocating massive guerrilla warfare a la *Red Dawn* against any possible Soviet invasion. Well yes, Don, I *do* strongly favor the right to bear arms, and I do believe it impossible for a government to tyrannize any population where the people are armed to the teeth. And yes I *did* like *Red Dawn*, which was brown-baited by all left-wing critics. And by the way, Don old boy, where do *you* stand on gun control? Since both the Randians and the neo-cons tend to favor gun control, what do *you* say about it? Or are you going to say that only Pat Buchanan and a few of us "laissez-faire utopians" are opposed to gun control, and stand foursquare on the Second Amendment?

And yes, I *did* like *Red Dawn*, which was brown-baited by all left-wing critics.

Pat Buchanan of course cannot be dismissed by Feder as some obscure turkey, since obviously Buchanan's circulation and audience is gigantic as compared to Don Feder's. So what does Feder do to dismiss Buchanan? Ah, of course, what else? He dredges up the old anti-anti-Semitic ploy, except that *he* is even more hysterical about it than Weisberg, Muravchik, and the rest of the crew. Feder goes so far as to liken Pat's positions as akin to "the collected correspondence of Adolf Eichmann and Julius Streicher." To paraphrase Don Feder's former guru Ayn Rand, it almost makes one wish that Don would meet up with people like Eichmann, Streicher, et al. personally, and find out the difference between them and Pat "on his own hide."

Feder protests that, unlike neocons, he supported Goldwater rather than Humphrey or Johnson in 1964. He's right about that; in those days, he was a Randian. In later days, he found religion, and came to support various theocratic policies. Lew Rockwell has the last word on this phenomenon. "The only thing worse than a Randian," says Lew, "is a Randian who has Found Religion and stayed a Randian."

Burt Blumert just reminds me that Feder had his own newsletter in the 1970s, *First Principles*, but the Randian rag went out of business because he couldn't get any subscribers. So much for the *Tropical Fish Quarterly*! •

The Molestitarian Party?

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

A few years ago, a friend of mine was invited to dinner at the home of a top Libertarian theorist and psychiatrist. The evening was disrupted, however, as the doctor's small boy ran through the house screaming that he hated his father. As it turned out, the kid had a point.

The psychiatrist explained to my friend that since children have the same rights as adults, it would be immoral for him to force his son to go to bed.

After all, he related, you can't force your next-door neighbor to go to sleep just because you think it's good for him. As a Libertarian, he could only try to persuade his child. The persuasion hadn't worked, but that was the price of liberty.

The doctor went on to tell my friend about the moral dilemma he'd faced as a new parent: his baby hated having his diaper changed. Since we can't force our next-door neighbor to change his clothes, can we force

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an infant to do so?

After much Libertarian theorizing, the doctor—who gets paid actual money to treat mental patients—decided that since an unchanged diaper could cause disease, he had the right to clean the kid's rear end.

But we can't take this too far, he warned. He could not wipe his unwilling child's nose because a snotty nose wasn't dangerous. After all, we don't have the right to wipe our next-door neighbor's nose...

This sounds, I know, like something from the Planet Zucchini, but it is straight out of the platform of the Libertarian Party, "the party of principle."

Some principle. Like socialists, the LP seeks to abolish parental authority. "Children are human beings," says the LP, "and, as such, have all the rights of human beings." In the Libertarian view, only the "initiation of force" is immoral. Everything else is acceptable, for adults and children.

That's why the LP endorses the right to run away from home: "Children have the right to seek other guardians who place a higher value on their lives." There must be no laws "forcing children" of any age "to remain in the custody of their parents against their will."

The LP also advocates "the repeal of all laws regarding consensual sexual relations" regardless of age, "all laws regulating or prohibiting the possession, use, sale, production, or distribution of sexually explicit material" involving adults or children, all laws against the televising of child and other "'pornography'" (their platform puts the word in quotes), and all laws that restrict "children from engaging in voluntary exchanges of goods, services, or information regarding human sexuality."

In the LP's ideal world, your 10-year-old daughter could be lured to a house and sexually molested for a pornographic film, which is then televised, and you couldn't complain as long as she "consented." Your eight-year-old son could be bribed away from home with toys and candy by the North American Man-Boy Love Association, and that too is fine, so long as he "consented."

The Libertarian Party does have some standards, however. It condemns "the attempts by parents" to "force children to conform" to the parents' "religious views."

It's LP time. Do you know where your children are?

"The world we seek to build is one where individuals are free to follow their own dreams in their own ways without interference from government or an authoritarian power," says the Libertarian Party: the "authoritarian power" of fathers and mothers.

At any Libertarian Party gathering, the most popular political button reads "Resist Authority." Libertarians talk about resisting the unjust authority of the state, but they are actually concerned with rebelling against the just authority of parents, community, tradition, and morality.

Authority is every bit as important to society as liberty, as the institution of the family shows, but the Libertarian Party rejects this, and thus undermines true liberty.

In Western civilization, children have always been entrusted to the authority of their parents. Opposed to this is the socialist view, which sees children as belonging ultimately to the state, or the Libertarian view, which sees children as legitimate victims of adult perversion. Libertarians are culturally left-wing on many issues; here they may be worse than Reds.

The Libertarian Party's one principle, "non-initiation of force," is fine for the rough and tumble of practical politics, but not as the only rule for society. Make it such, and spanking becomes a felony, as does what the LP platform decries as "confinement" for religious instruction.

In 1988, a good man won the Libertarian nomination for president. But Congressman Ron Paul's disagreements with the LP on children's rights, abortion, feminism, Martin Luther King, and many other social issues caused a backlash among party activists, who criticized him as "too straight, too white, and too conservative." In 1992, they will make no such

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mistake.

I'm a libertarian, but as a parent, I'd worry if the Libertarian Party ever won an election. Child molesters would be honored citizens; decent parents would be in jail.

A candidate for the 1992 Libertarian presidential nomination recently endorsed the right to engage in child pornography. You couldn't be a Libertarian, he said, *unless you concurred.* And at least one LP official is also an official in NAMBLA.

Are the child-related parts of the LP platform mere ideological windsurfing? I wonder. If one were a child molester, and wanted fraternal support, where would one go? Even the Democrats would have nothing to do with you. Could this be one of the reasons that women, far more perceptive about these things than men, avoid the LP? ●

P.C. Watch

by L.H.R., Jr.

Jungle Fever

NPR thought it was shocking—and undoubtedly racist—when Spike Lee's *Jungle Fever* didn't win the top prize at the Cannes film festival. Who could reject this great movie about miscegenation and why blacks should oppose it, but whites not? The movie shows, said the reviewer, that blacks have to put racial solidarity first, a rule that apparently doesn't apply to the white awards jury.

In an interview in *Playboy*, Spike ruminated further on miscegenation: "I've never seen black men with fine white women. They be ugly. Mugly, dogs. And you always see white men with good looking black women."

Ow Bar

The Au Bar in Palm Beach, where the Kennedy boys went for their drinks that fateful night, is Teddy's favorite in Florida. "To give you a feeling" for the place, says the *Washington Monthly*, one of the other regulars is a man who wears a "sportcoat, necktie, black miniskirt, black stockings, and black high heels." As he stepped into his chauffeur-driven Rolls, he explained: "I'm a multimillionaire and I like to dress in women's clothes."

Shrinkette

Frances Welshing, MD, a black psychiatrist in Washington, D.C., known for her anti-white diatribes, recently explained on radio why the Nazis hated the Jews: "You see, the word 'Semite' comes from the Latin prefix 'semi,' meaning 'only half white.'"

Dr. Billy

Billy Joel, the rock and roll singer, recently received an honorary doctorate from Fairfield University in Connecticut, a Jesuit school. One of Joel's typical songs, "Only the Good Die Young," endorses sexual promiscuity and condemns Catholic teenage girls for not engaging in it. What I want to know is, where is Clement XIV now that we really need him?

B.C.?

When the Rev. Al Sharpton carried his P.C. crusade to Britain in April, he found the press somewhat freer than here. "The fat black American preacher who is credited by his critics with his ability to reduce Britain to a burning cauldron of racial conflict flew into Gatwick Airport yesterday in a bit of a huff," wrote the London *Sunday Telegraph*. "Huge black security men in blazers and with cropped hair surrounded the portly civil rights activist, propelling him across the arrivals hall, leaving bruised and bewildered passengers limping in their wake. Perhaps the week will tell whether Mr. Sharpton is a dangerous subversive or an entertaining windbag."

Touring Britain's ghettos in a white Mercedes, Sharpton accused the Queen of "sitting on top of a racist empire." If "the Queen would speak up," he said, there would be no racial problem in Britain. Asked if he had discovered much racism in the U.K, Sharpton gestured at a garbage-filled ghetto street filled with burned out stores and said, "Well, this sure doesn't look like downtown, does it?"

Sharpton knew, because he was staying downtown in a $510-a-night suite in Mayfair's Grosvenor House hotel, and said he would like to visit Britain often and preach at Westminster Abbey. "How does he spell his name?" asked the dean of the abbey, when informed of the request.

Our Rulers

During a recent cabinet meeting, says *Spy* magazine, George Bush passed a note to Dan Quayle: "How do you titillate an ocelot? You oscillate her tit a lot!" This doesn't exhaust the presidential sense of humor, however. George was given a carved wooden table by a third-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world dignitary, it's base a man with a large, erect penis. At first the prez kept the table in the Oval Office, but then moved it into the First Bathroom. Lately, he has taken great pleasure in telling female aides: "Do me a favor and get those papers I left in the table in the bathroom."

In the Bag

A beaming Bertie Harper told the assembled reporters, "It feels wonderful, like I just won the lottery or something." He had been acquitted of murdering his wife, a cancer patient whom he said had wanted to commit suicide. They had traveled from California—which bars "assisted suicide"—to Michigan, which has no such law (yet). His wife took a large dose of tranquilizers, and then when she fell asleep, Harper pulled a plastic bag over her head and tied it around her neck. Said the defense attorney, "This is an act of love."

Afro-Hermeneutic

Professor Eric Abercrumbie, director of minority programs and services at the University of Cincinnati and a member of the Afro-American studies department, says his "favorite book is *The Holy Bible* because it provides the blackprint for salvation. Also, it represents the true truth regarding Afrocentric human creation and existence. In spite of white racist efforts to enslave black people and fallacious symbols and information, the true historical and sociological documentation clearly represents that black people were the original people and that all of humanity comes from the womb of black women. Furthermore..., Jesus was a black man. Therefore, even though white racists have presented the idea that black people have contributed nothing to humanity, *The Holy Bible* clearly indicates that we have made the most important contribution."

The Other Video

One day last October in the Brentwood section of Washington, D.C., five young black men robbed two older black men. The criminals then beat their victims unconscious, shot one in the chest, and urinated on the face of the other. We know this because one of the five videotaped the whole thing, in between his own punches and kicks, and then interviewed his four accomplices TV-newsman style. He also included shots of the interested crowd that stood nearby and watched.

Hiring whom you want is a crime against the state.

The tape was widely shown in the community until one honest person gave it to the police in January. The five criminals, who gave their names and addresses on the tape, are now on trial.

Anti-White?

In the national whine-a-rama, who could be surprised that more and more white Americans are suing Japanese-owned companies for discrimination? The Japanese are accused (warning: adult material to follow) of preferring their own nationals as managers. Virtually all Japanese managers are also men, further getting them into trouble.

This is under broad legal attack now, and new mandated hiring practices will make the firms less efficient, which is undoubtedly a government motive. There is much envy and hatred in D.C. of a people who supply us with well-made goods at prices we want to pay.

In a related development, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is suing an employment agency in California that Japanese firms used. Interplace/Transworld Recruit had a code to disguise employers' wants. "Talk to Adam" meant a man. "Talk to Mariko" meant a Japanese. "Talk to Eve, suite 20-30" meant a white woman between 20 and 30 years old. Wanting to hire whom you want is, of course, one of the most serious crimes against the state.

Sapphy

The National Lesbian Conference met in Atlanta in April to combat the last frontier of white male privilege: "White gay men carry white male privilege in gay rights' organizations," charged

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Suzanne Pharr, a conference organizer. But "our togetherness is empowering us." She was cheered on by a San Francisco lesbian group, Gold Dykes known for its nose rings and earrings connected by gold chains. "We don't have this in my country," said Olga Zhuk, a Soviet delegate.

Shout!

"Black people tend to shout in churches, movie theaters, and anywhere else they feel the need to shout, because when joy, pain, anger, confusion, frustration, ego, and thought mix it up, the way they do inside black people, the uproar is too big to hold inside," says black *Sports Illustrated* writer Ralph Wiley in his new book, *Why Black People Tend To Shout.*

"Black people tend to shout when they want the answers to questions that go unasked. Like, who knocked the nose off the Sphinx?" "Black people tend to shout because they are immortal and sense this. Black people sense this because we have been dying for years."

Pro-Man

Tertullian, the 2nd century father of the Church, not only gave us the proper attitude towards Modal Libertarians ("Hate, holy hate"), he also gave us the proper attitude towards development and the environment:

"Every territory [is now] opened to commerce," he wrote. "The most delightful farmsteads have obliterated areas formerly waste, plough-land has subdued the woods, domestic cattle have put to flight the wild beast, barren sands have become fertile, rocks are reduced to soil, swamps are drained, the number of cities today exceeds the number of isolated huts in former times, islands no longer inspire fear nor crags terror: everywhere people, everywhere organized communities, everywhere human life."

Only Yew

When I first started debating environmentalists on the West Coast "ancient forests" issue (I'm a youthful forests man myself), they would always mention the drug taxol as a reason logging should be stopped. Taxol, made from an extract of yew bark, is a promising treatment for ovarian cancer.

My response would be: you guys will oppose cutting down yews as well, and sure enough, there are now organized campaigns by such groups as the Native Yew Conservation Committee in Oregon to do exactly that. They are suing to prevent all yew logging on federal lands, no matter how many women have to die as a result. Trees are literally more important to these cultists than humans.

The Weyerhauser Company is planting yews on its privately owned land, but it will be decades before the trees are old enough to produce taxol. In the meantime, a guerrilla group stripped 500 pounds of yew bark off some trees on federal lands, and the U.S. Forest Service is offering a $5,000 reward. If the government actually bans all yew cutting, however, the black market will be the only way to get taxol. Every decent human being will have to say to the black marketeers: go to it. ●

Rothbard-Rockwell Report
Center for Libertarian Studies
P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
San Francisco, CA
Permit No. 1987

The Rothbard-Rockwell Report is published by the Center for Libertarian Studies, Post Office Box 4091, Burlingame, California 94011. (800) 325-7257.
Editors: Murray N. Rothbard and Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editor:* Sarah Barton, Joseph Sobran, "Frank W. Taussig." *Publisher:* Burton S. Blumert. *Managing Editor:* Sybil Regan. Subscription: $49 for 12 issues. Copyright ©1991 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED